DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 281 UD 030 209

AUTHOR Reynolds, Joseph E.
TITLE Florida's Full Service Schools: A Case Study of Three Oversight Committees.
PUB DATE Jun 94
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Joint Conference on School Health and Full Service Schools (2nd, St. Petersburg, FL, June 26-29, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Ancillary School Services; *Boards of Education; Case Studies; Comparative Analysis; Cooperation; Counties; *Delivery Systems; Elementary Education; Evaluation Methods; Interviews; *Policy Formation; Program Evaluation; Research Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Florida; *Full Service School Model; Interorganizational Relationships; Oversight Information Systems

ABSTRACT

In Florida, the Full Services Schools model has emerged as an alternative to fragmented service delivery because service providers have assumed that children have needs beyond classroom education and that Florida's system of service delivery has failed to meet those needs. The purpose of this multiple-site comparative case study is to describe and examine the governance structures of three full-service-school sites in three Florida counties. The framework is drawn from the theory of A. H. Van de Ven (1976) for assessing the development and maintenance of interorganizational relations. Data were collected through study of documents, site observation, and interviews with 42 selected participants. Differences and similarities in interorganizational relations are identified in the areas of (1) systems-oriented change; (2) membership of the oversight committees; and (3) collaboration, coordination, and cooperation. Recommendations are made for future research and for the development of policy and practice. (Contains 60 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

9116

ED 377 281

Second Annual Joint Conference on School Health
and Full Service Schools
June 26 - 29, 1994
St. Petersburg, Florida

Florida's Full Service Schools: A Case Study of Three Oversight Committees

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. E. Reynolds
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented by:

Joseph E. Reynolds, MHS, CRC
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Special Education
University of Florida

UD030209

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

A major shortcoming of this country's system for delivering human services is its inability to deal with children with multiple problems and their families in an effective, coordinated way (Cunningham, 1989; Kirst, 1991; Tyack, 1992). The fragmentation, specialization, and complexity of the current system prevent an effective delivery of services (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1991; Gardner, 1991; Soler, Shotten, & Bell, 1993). Many educators, human services professionals, and health care professionals suggest that one solution to this problem is to reorganize the current system by linking or integrating education, health, and human services. One method of service integration is interorganizational collaboration.

Blank and Lombardi (1992) described interagency or interorganizational collaboration for the purpose of providing integrated, comprehensive services as a preventive approach to dealing holistically and promptly with the profound needs of high risk children and their families. Morrill (1993) argued that past attempts at systems-oriented reform using interagency collaboration strategies were sought from forces outside the human services system. By contrast, the current impetus is primarily from providers within these complex systems. Collaborative efforts such as the San Diego City Schools' New Beginnings in California (Jehl & Kirst, 1992; New Beginnings, 1990; Payzant, 1992), Kentucky's Integrated Delivery System (KIDS) (Cunningham, 1993; Melaville & Blank, 1991), the Family Connection Program in

Savannah, Georgia (Kadel, 1992), the School-Based Youth Services Program of New Jersey (Chira, 1991; Glass, 1992), and the Beethoven Project in Chicago, Illinois (Cohen, 1989), exemplify a variety of service integration initiatives.

Interorganizational initiatives appear to be gaining attention at the local, state, and federal level; Stephens (1988) predicted the number of collaborative initiatives would increase during the 1990s. Palaich, Whitney, and Paolino (1991) and Useem (1991) agreed with Stephens (1988) that policymakers are increasingly relying on mandated interagency collaboration to realize policy goals. Although policymakers have legislated interorganizational collaboration to address multi-agency concerns, barriers remain to effective i..terorganizational program development and implementation (Useem, 1991). Kagen, Rivera, and Parker (1990) reported that even with isolated examples of developing and thriving collaborative programs, administrators thought they lacked the theoretical and experimental information that could direct and improve the process of collaborating and delivering comprehensive results. William Morrill (1993), Director of the National Center for Service Integration, identified exploration of the most appropriate or effective governance structure(s) for service integration efforts as one of the most pervasive and persistent "knowledge gaps" in this area of interorganizational relationships.

In summary, the development of effective interorganizational relationships to collaborate among the fields of education, health, and human services systems at all levels is critical to provide substantial reform of the current human services delivery systems. Behrman (1991) suggested that policymakers have found it necessary to mandate interorganizational relationships as a vital condition for the continued survival of many service delivery systems. Critical to these collaborative initiatives is the focus on the development of the interorganizational administrative and governance structures. Kagen, Riviera, and Parker (1990) observed that with the increasing trend of integrating health and human services within schools, "America is on the brink of a practical renaissance, reshaping how it delivers human services" (p.2).

Statement of the Problem

Changes in the way schools and human services organizations interact with children and families simply will not occur on a broad scale without serious revisions to how these service delivery systems are organized. Kirst (1992) cautioned that redirecting funding sources, or increased funding alone, would not likely change service systems enough to create better outcomes for children and families. He admitted that the outlook was more optimistic with transformations in the governance, technology, attitudes, and capacities of employees. In emerging models, such as San Diego's New Beginnings (Jehl & Kirst, 1992; New Beginnings, 1990; Payzant, 1992), this visionary process has

been implemented. Fundamental changes in the services delivery system have evolved to address areas of shared philosophy, organizational structure, cost efficiency and effectiveness, and the identification of institutional and legal barriers.

Similarly, in Florida the Full Service Schools model has emerged as an alternative to fragmented service delivery based on the assumptions that children bring more than educational needs to the classroom and Florida's system of service delivery, structured within discrete categorical boundaries, has failed to meet children's needs (Groves, 1992b). Florida's legislators responded to these assumptions and enacted the Full Service Schools Act of 1990. The legislation directed the Florida Departments of Education (FDOE) and Health and Rehabilitative Services (DHRS) to "jointly establish Full Service Schools to serve students from schools that have a student population that has a high risk of needing medical and social services" and to fully implement the initiative throughout the state by the 1995-1996 school year. The Full Service Schools Act (1990) was intended to make services convenient to students and families by using the school as a "hub" of services (Rist, 1990). With little guidance from the legislation, school administrators and state and community health and human services professionals have been challenged with implementing a systems-oriented reform.

Although the importance of interagency collaboration for integrating services has been acknowledged in a number of papers describing local and community collaborative initiatives, studies

exploring the governance of these new entities have not been reported. A study examining the governance issues involved in the development and implementation of an integrated services site should be useful to determine a particular structure or pattern of interorganizational collaboration that enhances systems-oriented change described by Bruner (1991), Kirst (1991), and Argranoff (1991).

Purpose and Questions

The purpose of this multiple-site case study is to describe and examine the governance structures of three Full Service School sites in Florida. The framework of this study has been drawn from Van de Ven's (1976) theory for assessing the development and maintenance of interorganizational relationships. Van de Ven's theory is appropriate for this study because, as Hord (1980) suggested, a researcher may adapt the framework to examine selected components of interorganizational relationships. The focal points of this inquiry will be an analysis of the interagency units in terms of the formalization, complexity, and centralization of the governance structures. The following research questions will guide data collection in this study:

1. How have the governance structures of the Full Service School sites developed?

2. How are the Full Service School sites administratively operated?

3. How have the member agencies procedurally formalized their interactions?

4. How has the member agencies' integration of the interorganizational governance structures affected the individual agencies?

Rationale

The predominant approach to examining the structures of interorganizational relationships has been within the defining disciplines of the individual relationships, such as the patterns of interagency collaboration within the field of human resources (Aldrich, 1976); the field of education (Hall, Clark, Giordano, Johnson, and Van Roekel, 1977; Louis & Rosenblum, 1981; Seppanen, 1990; Yin & Gwaltney, 1981); or variables of effective interorganizational relationships within a human services delivery system (Bayer, 1985; Roberts-DeGennarro, 1988). The researchers used narrow approaches in the area of interorganizational collaborations that are no longer consistent with current models of collaboration and services integration. The fundamental concept of the Full Service Schools model involves education, health, and social service organizations joining forces collaboratively to contribute to the effectiveness, efficiency, and economy of service delivery. According to Redburn (1977), services integration achieved through interorganizational collaboration involves organizational and administrative changes in programs that deliver services, and changes in the nature and delivery of services. Agranoff (1991) suggested that the necessary systems-oriented changes would have substantial challenges. These challenges included (a) designing

more coherent public policies; (b) strategic planning and policy development; (c) operational planning, programming, and budgeting; and (d) collective decision-making.

Currently, there is a gap in the existing literature about the nature and design of the organizational and governance structures of interorganizational collaborative initiatives for integrating services (Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1991; National Association of State Boards of Education, 1992). This study will investigate the design and structure of the governing entities of three Florida Full Service School sites. Van de Ven's (1976) theory of interorganizational relationships is used as a conceptual framework to compare and contrast the formalization, centralization, and complexity of the governing bodies.

Structural Dimensions

The structural dimensions of Van de Ven's (1976) theoretical framework relate to the way in which agencies initiate and maintain interorganizational structures. According to Van de Ven, the behavior of agencies interacting as part of a social action system cannot be adequately explained by examining the behavior of the individual organizations involved. To achieve goals as a unit, the social action system adopts a structure for organizing the activities of the participating member organizations. Van de Ven identified formalization, centralization, and complexity as the key components of interorganizational administration.

Structural Properties of Interorganizational Relationships

Central to the development of interorganizational relationships are the structures developed to maintain and support interagency collaboration. These structural dimensions of interorganizational collaborative efforts include formalization, centralization, and complexity (Van de Van, 1976; Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980). Formalization refers to the degree to which rules, policies, and procedures govern interorganizational agreements and contacts. Formalization has a continuum from verbalized agreement to written contract to legal mandate. Centralization refers to the locus of decision-making. Warren (1974) observed that initially the structure of pooled decision-making is customarily very weak, with a minimum of authority. Later, as it takes on the characteristics of a formal organization, collective decision-making becomes increasingly relevant. Centralization can then be measured as the perceived degree of influence of agency representatives in making decisions that are binding upon the member agencies.

The structural complexity of an interorganizational relationship refers to the number of distinguishable elements that must be integrated in order for the interorganizational relationship to function as a unit. The indicators include the number of organizations and the number of different issues or tasks on which the relationship is based. As stated previously, the dyadic or pairwise relationship is the simplest form of interorganizational relationship, while the network is the most

complex. Also, the relationship becomes more complex as the number of different projects, activities, and problems taken on by the interorganizational relationship increase (Aiken & Hage, 1978).

Development of Full Service Schools in Florida

In May 1991, Governor Lawton Chiles described his vision for Florida's schools:

> "I look forward to the time when we keep schools open to 10 o'clock every night, have them going 12 months a year, make them a place where poor families can pick up Food Stamps and their food from the WIC program and their AFDC checks, and where they can sign up for job training." (Taylor, 1991, p. A1)

In this statement, Governor Chiles described the basic tenets of Full Service Schools. Groves (1991) described the Full Service School as one that integrates education, medical, social, and/or human services that are beneficial to meeting the needs of children and their families on school grounds or in locations which are easily accessible.

Enacted in 1990, the Full Service Schools Act required the Florida Departments of Education (FDOE) and Health and Rehabilitative Services (DHRS) to "jointly establish Full Service Schools to serve students from schools that have a student population that has a high risk of needing medical and social services" and to implement the initiative fully throughout the state by the 1995-1996 school year. During the 1991-1992 fiscal year, $6.1 million was allocated to 32 school districts around the state through a competitive grant process. The funding was secured through collapsed funding of school volunteer programs,

extended day enrichment programs, teen parent programs, interagency student service programs, and drop-out prevention programs. The funds were used to provide treatment and support services for children and their families through the development of state and local, public and private partnerships. Full Service School projects affected approximately 70 elementary, middle, high, and alternative schools around the state (Groves, 1992a).

The Full Service Schools Act of 1990, which mandated an increased development of interagency collaboration at the state and local level, generated several demonstration models. At the state level, Interagency Work Groups comprised of agency representatives from the FDOE, the DHRS, the Department of Labor and Employment Securities (DLES), and the Governor's Office were organized and addressed primary issues affecting the implementation of the Full Service Schools Act (1990). These targeted issues included technology and training, problem solving and barrier removal, linkages, and resource support.

One hundred thirty-four Florida schools in 44 districts and one university laboratory school received funding for interorganizational collaborative services through the Office of Interagency Affairs during the 1992-1993 fiscal year. Total FDOE funding appropriated for Full Service Schools dropped to $5.5 million from the previous year (Groves, 1993). The Full Service Schools Act (1990), implemented by the Office of Interagency Affairs through the FDOE, was designed to benefit students and

their families. In a first mid-year formative report, Groves (1992a) enumerated programmatic benefits of the Full Service Schools, including improved service delivery due to collaboration and co-location of services at the school sites, improved information sharing across disciplines, and a positive shift toward preventive interaction with families instead of crisis management.

In the spring of 1993, the Florida Legislature demonstrated support for the Full Service Schools initiative with an allocated $6.3 million in funding for the 1993-1994 fiscal year (Groves, 1993). This appropriation was connected to 386 schools in 52 school districts and 1 university laboratory school with active programs of integrated services. More recently, the legislature earmarked $9.3 million in the coming fiscal year of 1994-1995 for Florida's Full Service Schools (Groves, 1994).

In summary, interagency collaboration resulting in integrated services in schools has been widely practiced. However, the professional literature is lacking a critical examination of attempts of governance structures linking human and health services in the educational setting (Morrill, 1993). In the past 20 years, state and federal initiatives supporting collaborative services have increased. A primary example of this growing trend is the Full Service Schools Act of Florida (1990).

Tyack (1992) stated that efforts to integrate social, health, and education services have reflected social opinions and values and, therefore, are strongly subject to socio-political

influences. Yin (1989) advocated the use of interorganizational analysis to provide policy-makers and administrators information about the sociocultural and organizational context of complex social units. Because of the interorganizational nature of the Full Service School site, a multiple-case study approach was selected as the most appropriate research method to examine the governance structures. The case study methodology is complimented by Van de Ven's (1976) conceptual framework of structural dimensions through defining the issues, concerns, and claims of participating agencies (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) into three categories for investigation. These categories are the structural dimensions of formalization, complexity, and centralization of the interorganizational network.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the interorganizational relationships of the governance structures of Florida's Full Service Schools using selective characteristics of Van de Ven's (1976) conceptual framework of interorganizational relationships. A case study approach with emphasis on interorganizational analysis methods of data collection was employed. Grounded in literature on interorganizational theory and interorganizational collaboration, the following research questions guided the data collection:

1. How have the governance structures of the Full Service School sites developed?

2. How are the Full Service School sites administratively operated?

3. How have the member agencies procedurally formalized their interactions?

4. How has the member agencies' integration of the interorganizational governance structures affected the individual agencies?

Research Design

This research study was designed as a comparative case study of the governing structures of three interorganizational collaborative sites funded under Florida's Full Service Schools Act (1990). Because studying all existing 375 Full Service School sites was not feasible due to time and funding restrictions, three were selected as representative from a class

(Merriam, 1988). Traditionally, many researchers have chosen to use descriptive research methods such as ethnographic studies or case studies to examine factors affecting interorganizational relationships (Bryman, 1989; Seppanen, 1990; Yin & Gwaltney, 1981). These methods included purposive sampling (Patton, 1989), focused synthesis (Doty, 1982), interviewing (Evan, 1978; Seidman, 1991), and observation (Bryman, 1989; Rogers & Whetten, 1982).

Data collection of this study took place from February through May, 1994, requiring approximately 138 hours of field work. Prior to subject selection, permission to review documents, observe meetings, and interview informants was obtained from the local school board office, the principal or site managers, and the University of Florida Institutional Review Board (Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects).

Site Selection

Three Full Service School sites were selected as representative of the Full Service Schools phenomenon from the 70 sites originally funded through the Full Service School Act (1990). The site selection criteria included

1. Sites met the operational definition of Full Service School with on-going demonstration of education, health, and human service agencies providing service delivery on-site or at an easily accessible site.

2. Sites represented only one school district and one health and human service delivery area, so that comparisons and

contrasts in different school districts and human service delivery regions could be explored.

3. Sites represented small, middle-sized, and larger counties.

4. Sites had three consecutive years of funding through the Full Service Schools Act (1990).

Permission to conduct research of the individual governing bodies of the Full Service Schools was obtained once the sites were selected. The counties are ordered by size with County A representing the small county, County B representing the middle-sized district, and County C representing the larger district. The sites are referred to as County A, County B, and County C to maintain the confidentiality of participants.

Participant Selection

After the three sites had been determined, individuals identified as contact or liaison persons by the Office of Interagency Affairs (Florida Department of Education) were contacted by telephone. Contact persons identified the procedures for approval to conduct research in the respective school districts. The school districts' approval to conduct research was secured from the appropriate district level personnel. The researcher scheduled site visits to confirm the appropriateness of site selections and obtained preliminary records for focused synthesis. Among the requested records was a list of previous and current members of the Full Service School sites' Oversight Committees (OSC) and meeting attendance records.

The selection criteria for interviewing representatives from the member agencies included

1. Nomination from fellow committee members identifying the participant as currently or previously involved in the interorganizational relationship.

2. Only one representative from a member agency or division within that same agency.

3. Participant had demonstrated steady attendance to OSC meetings.

The interview selection process identified 12 participants from County A representing the community, education, physical and mental health, and social services. Fifteen participants from the OSC and the Full Service School site's Planning Council were selected from County B representing education, mental health, and social services. Fifteen participants were identified from County C representing the community, education, physical and mental health, and social services.

RESULTS

The primary sources of data were collected through observations, semi-structured interviews, and a focused synthesis of relevant records culminating in approximately 138 hours of field work. Participants were observed in seven interorganizational meetings occurring between February and May 1994. Sixty-three individual items were collected from the participating committees, school and health and human service districts, and state offices for review and focused synthesis. Interviews were conducted with 42 selected participants between February 1994 and April 1994.

Summary

The interorganizational relationships evidenced through formalization, centralization, and complexity are emerging at different stages of development of the Full Service Schools initiative in each county researched. In the small county, County A, the structural domain of formalization governing the family service center model is reflected in the prescribed mechanisms of interagency interaction through participating agency application and interagency agreements. Centralization of the OSC began as pooled decision-making under the auspices of the school board; however, during the research period members demonstrated more collective decision-making style. It was the perception of the participants that the leadership in County A guided and directed the development of the Full Service School OSC in the earlier stages, warranting members the authority to

resolve conflicts, problem solve, and strategically plan for the initiative. The goal of the OSC of County A was to create a "masterpiece of shared space." The complexity of the task of integrating services demonstrated in County A was extensive over a two year planning process. Work groups were established and assigned the tasks of developing admission criteria, creating an interagency agreement protocol, and designing the physical building with the assistance of the architect. These components added to the success and the development of the complex formal structure of the OSC found in County A.

With the OSC of County B determined ineffectual, an alternative governing structure was identified at the Full Service School site. Referred to as the site's Planning Council, this governing body represents the grant funded activities or component areas of service delivery at the Full Service School site. Initiated approximately two years ago, the Planning Council provides input and suggestions to the site coordinator and coordinates site activities. The site components are primarily regulated by the policies of the individual funding agents; however, resources have been blended and collaboration encouraged among service areas. During one Planning Council meeting the members were observed demonstrating pooled decision-making on the scheduling of summer activities. Coordinating the schedule of activities was necessary because of the various conflicts of the participating agencies and programs. Although the Planning Council is expected to provide input and discussion

on programmatic issues, the ultimate decisions of day-to-day functioning remains with the site coordinator. The complexity of the Full Service School site's Planning Council has increased as the services of the Full Service School site have multiplied. The development of the site as a cohesive unit with an early childhood and family focus has largely been the result of the site coordinator and the other members of the Planning Council.

The original informal structure of the OSC in County C has changed during this study. With a large membership of approximately 40 individuals, the OSC has a formidable task of redirecting the focus of individual programs to encourage a shared vision among agencies. Identified as an information-sharing collective, the OSC provided monitoring and evaluating services of the programs receiving the Full Service School grant funding. Meeting monthly to comply with grant requirements the Full Service School sites primarily functioned independent of the OSC, with the site coordinators reporting back to the OSC on site activities and budget concerns. Only one contracted agreement for nursing services was recorded at the Full Service School site in County C. Volunteer services were observed on site, but no written agreements were reviewed.

The complexity of the interorganizational relationships increased during the research period. Pooled decision-making was observed in the earlier OSC meetings. More recent OSC meetings demonstrated an increased seriousness about the direction and goals of the committee with increased incidence of collective or

shared decision-making in sub-committees. There was a decrease in the time committed to the existing programs and more focus on future planning efforts. Standing subcommittees were established with an expectation of participating members to meet together outside the regularly scheduled OSC meeting.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Application of Findings to Research Questions

Historical Development

In this study, the development of the OSC of Full Service School initiatives in three separate school districts and health and human service delivery areas in Florida was examined. Members of the individual OSC were interviewed and pertinent records were reviewed to assist in forming the unique history of each of the OSC. Although varying in resources and size, several similarities were noted among the OSC representing a small, middle-sized, and large county. Similarities included the committees' historical development and purpose.

Similarities. All three OSC emanated from the school board of each district primarily because funding was channeled from the Florida Department of Education (FDOE) to the school districts. Following the state educational agency's example, local education agencies assumed the leadership role in these multi-agency initiatives. These school-generated efforts were joined or supported by already existing grass-roots groups involved with the advocacy, case management, and delivery of children's services in the community. All participants interviewed found such community groups essential to the support and maintenance of the collaborative efforts. Participants in all three counties identified the primary purposes of the OSC to be providing direction, monitoring, and evaluation of programs.

Differences. Dissimilarities in the development among the OSC were found in the selection of members, composition of membership, and frequency of meetings. Early OSC documents and participant interviews indicated that the selection process varied between the three OSC. The membership selection process restricted the composition of the individual OSC, and may have affected the involvement of agencies or organizations not represented. For example, Counties A and C originated with a core group of school board employees, and through a nomination process community and agency representatives were added.

In County B, the original grant application specifically called for an over-representation of school board employees among the OSC membership. Within this study, participants indicated that County B's OSC was essentially ineffectual and served to comply with the grant requirement of signing off on an annual program evaluation for the FDOE. The site's Planning Council was identified as an alternative to the OSC and as a more authentic governance structure representing the diverse program components and affecting the direction, activities, and development of the Full Service School site.

Formalization

The interactions of the participating agencies and their representatives impacted the administration of the respective Full Service School sites in various ways. Through the development of written interagency agreements, verbal agreements,

OSC admission criteria, and contracted services, interactions of the three OSCs share similarities and differences.

Similarities. All three Full Service School sites administer contracted services between agencies represented on the respective OSC. These services included mental health counseling by a private provider on County A's OSC, mental health services from a community mental health provider on County B's OSC, and nursing services provided under contract by the health department and represented on County C's OSC. The provision of services were initiated prior to service providers attaining membership on the respective OSC. Participants and records indicated that because these individuals were involved in contracted services, they were selected for OSC membership.

Differences. Written interagency agreements were reviewed only from County A. No written interagency agreements were recorded which affected the administration of Counties B and C OSC or Full Service School sites.

OSC work groups developed the entrance application and written interagency agreements used by County A. These collaborative efforts demonstrated a concerted effort as the committee established standardized mechanisms to support and maintain a high level of interorganizational collaboration at the OSC level and the Full Service School site. The primary means of interagency agreement in County B existed as a verbal agreement between a former school superintendent and the district administrator of the state health and human service agency. No

written interagency agreements were recorded and participants confirmed that verbal arrangements were informal at the OSC and site level. Although a strong reliance of verbal agreements was not recommended in the literature (Blank & Lombardi, 1992; Bruner, 1991), the practice of verbal agreements has not deterred the continued development of County B's Full Service School site.

Although participants in County C were not concerned with written interagency agreements during the early stages of the development of the OSC and the Full Service School site, recent meetings and discussions indicated that committee members were focused on more formalized means of coordinating services at the site. By establishing standing subcommittees, members identified formal interactions between agencies as a priority. From contracted services and verbal agreements to more formalized interactions, County C's OSC has progressed toward a more organized structure as demonstrated in County A.

Centralization

Several researchers have agreed that shared decision-making is a critical component of interorganizational development and is essential to initiate and maintain effective and permanent interorganizational relationships (Goldman & Intriligator, 1990; Rogers & Whetten, 1982; Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980). Of the three Full Service School OSC and sites examined, only County A clearly demonstrated shared decision-making. Few similarities between OSC or sites were exposed during this study. The OSC of Counties A and C and the Planning Council of County B were found to be at

varying stages of development and therefore affected the administration of the Full Service School sites in different ways.

County A. The OSC of County A demonstrated a highly organized structure which fostered a forum for shared decision-making among the participating agency representatives. OSC members voted on both membership and proposed interagency agreements prior to school board approval. At the Full Service School site, the principal and site coordinator stated that decisions affecting the school and site would be shared. Agency representatives reported that the OSC provided a forum to voice concerns and issues evolving from the site, but that problems would first be addressed with the site coordinator. Several participants regarded the familiarity of working in a small community as beneficial in the development and implementation of the Full Service Schools initiative. Having recurring professional and personal interactions appeared to have also assisted in the development of the OSC of County A. Additionally, the communication between members was described as formal and informal, with a reliance on community relationships.

County B. Decision-making affecting the relationships between participating agencies and overall administration of B's Full Service School site rested primarily with three stakeholders: the site coordinator and two district-level program supervisors. Programmatic decision-making affecting the day-to-day functioning of the Full Service School site, on the other

hand, was provided primarily by the site coordinator in conjunction with the site's Planning Council. Comprised of representatives of the various components of the service areas, the Planning Council engaged in pooled decision-making on site activities and programmatic matters. The Planning Council resembled what Kirst (1991) referred to as a step toward a systems-oriented change of how integrated services should be delivered for children and families.

County C. At the beginning of this study, the OSC of County C began transforming and progressed through the stages from informal information-sharing collective to the initial stages of an organized, goal-directed, governance structure exercising shared decision-making. Expanding beyond the required program monitoring and evaluation, the OSC forged a new direction supported by subcommittees and an empowered membership. Accepting the authority to make decisions as a group, the OSC recently developed a mission statement and planned for future Full Service Schools related initiatives. The Full Service School site examined in County C resembled that of a traditional school with the site coordinator as the principal or lead administrator. A review of the data indicated no systems-oriented change as a result from the influence of the OSC or other interorganizational relationships.

Complexity

Interorganizational complexity refers to the number of distinguishable elements that must be integrated in order for the

interorganizational relationship to function as a cohesive unit (Aiken & Hage, 1978; Van de Ven & Ferry, 1980). The integration of services and stakeholders' issues must be addressed in a developing complex structure. Palaich, Whitney, and Paolino (1991) suggested that the more participants involved in a collaborative effort, the more complex the collaboration becomes. Similarities and differences were identified between the three sites and their respective OSC.

Similarities. The strongest similarities were found between Counties A and B because of the family services center model implemented at the respective Full Service School sites. Both sites provided multiple services co-located for children and families from multiple agencies representing different disciplines. The task of integrating the delivery of services in such a fashion indicated complex interorganizational relationships; however, that was where the similarities ended and the differences began.

An examination of the OSC revealed that County A developed a strong interorganizational structure reflective of complex networks and systems. The complexity of the interorganizational relationships demonstrated in County A was strengthened by the leadership styles of the coordinators, the active participation of independent agencies, and the creation of a pivotal agency position assigned to develop and implement the Full Service Schools initiative. These facilitative factors provided an

environment for County A to develop the governing structure currently in place.

Contrasting the functional OSC of County A, County B's Planning Council may have evolved because of the ineffectual OSC found in County B. The Full Service School site's Planning Council may be compensating for the lack of complex structure in the OSC, in addition to the low formalization and centralization of interorganizational relationships.

While County C exhibited degrees of low formalization, centralization, and complexity at the OSC level, the members of the OSC were observed changing from an information-sharing collective to a more complex organization displaying increased formal and centralized interactions between agencies and representatives.

Differences. Two primary differences identified between the participating OSC involved trust between participants and limited agency representation. DeStefano and Snauwaert (1989) associated lack of trust among agency representatives and philosophical differences as barriers to effective interorganizational collaboration and Kadel (1992) argued that broad representation was necessary for developing a useful governing body. Trust between top level administrators was critical in the early stages of development of the Full Service School site of County B. Trust remains vital to the continuation of integrated services because of the reliance on verbal agreements between agencies and the lack of agency and community representation on the OSC.

Unlike the other counties, County B's OSC displayed a distinctive absence of broad community and service agency representation on the OSC.

Implications of Research Findings

A number of findings in this research have implications for research in the areas of interorganizational relationships and integrated services and more specifically in the development of interorganizational governance structures of Florida's Full Service Schools. The primary areas of interest are systems-oriented change, membership, and the definition of collaboration.

Systems-oriented Change

Redburn (1977) argued that true interorganizational collaboration needed for integrated services requires radical administrative and organizational changes between participating agencies. Kirst (1991) supported Redburn's (1977) assertion and added that implementing multi-agency initiatives, such as Florida's Full Service Schools Act (1990), requires a radical systems-oriented change; however, challenges exist to systems-oriented changes. Agranoff (1991) identified the following challenges to systems-oriented change: (a) designing more coherent public policies; (b) strategic planning and policy development; (c) operational planning, programming, and budgeting; and (d) collective decision-making.

In the small rural County A, the OSC addressed three of the four barriers to administrative changes indicated by Agranoff (1991). The OSC are working toward an elimination of barriers to

change through the creation of a unique administrative position within the health and human service agency entitled the Full Service Schools Coordinator, extensive use of collaboratively designed interagency agreements and OSC membership applications, operational planning and programming with shared budgeting, and collective decision-making among agency representatives on the OSC.

Similar changes were found at the Full Service School site of the middle-sized County B and directly linked to the site's Planning Council. This unique administrative structure combined pooled budgeting and decision-making between component leaders. After three years of grant funding, the larger County C floundered through complacency, but recently began the initial steps toward pooled decision-making and increased focus on written interagency agreements.

In summary, County A incorporated the facilitative factors necessary for radical systems-oriented change. Possible explanations include:

1. Smaller service delivery areas involved fewer critical key players.

2. Frequent personal and professional contacts enhanced cooperation and coordination among members.

3. Fewer administrative levels existed to facilitate change. OSC members were representative of authoritative positions.

OSC Membership

The selection of OSC membership is important to provide representation of the respective communities and leadership to the group. Broad community support and participation on governance boards implementing integrated services was advocated by Kadel (1992) and Blank and Lombardi (1992). County A's OSC demonstrated that having a broad representation of stakeholders and persons at levels of authority was vital to a productive governance body. Planners of County B's OSC overloaded the governing committee with school district employees rendering the committee void of representation of diverse disciplines. Participants in County B reported that the primary role of the OSC was to sanction the annual report prepared for the state education agency, which does not require interagency involvement.

While County C had a broad representation of community agencies at many OSC meetings, members often held no authority to enforce decisions that may have affected the representative agencies. Participants reported that until recently there were rarely any opportunities to engage in pooled or shared decision-making. Originally designed as an information-sharing forum, County C's OSC limited ability to effect systems-oriented change stemmed from a lack of leadership, organizational direction and goals, and sense of mission between the participating agencies and community representatives.

Absent from each OSC studied is the representation of county or local government agencies and strong association with the

business community. The Center for the Study of Social Policy (1991) strongly advised the inclusion of representation of local overnment on interorganizational governance boards to promote, encourage, and facilitate development of these unique organizational structures. Gray (1985) supported the cooperation of business, labor, and government in collaborative problem-solving from an interorganizational domain.

Leadership

In a synthesis of the literature Hord (1986) determined that shared leadership or mutual control was ideal for collaborative initiatives. The quality and style of leadership greatly influences the interorganizational process and affects the governance bodies. Three different styles were observed in this study.

County A. County A's leadership was described by participants as "easy-going and laid-back" and dually as a "leader and a guide." County A's leaders envision goals, affirm values, motivate, manage, achieve unity among groups, and represent the group. All descriptive of what Bruner (1991) referred to as a laundry list of leadership qualities necessary for interorganizational collaborative ventures.

County B. County B's site coordinator along with two district level supervisors were identified as the leaders of the multi-agency initiative. These participants are goal-directed and share a common vision of the Full Service School initiative. The site coordinator is involved with the site's Planning Council

and provides direction and encourages pooled decision-making among Council members.

County C. The direction of the OSC in County C is under the leadership of a school district administrator who admitted that the Full Service School initiative was his responsibility. Participants described the OSC chairperson as a leader with too many projects, disorganized, and lacking knowledge of the initiative. Several participants suggested a county coordinator with the primary responsibility of coordinating the Full Service Schools initiative would be more effective.

Descriptions of the proposed position are similar to the Full Service School Coordinator employed by County A's health and human service agency. The leadership role of OSC changed during this study from a single individual to the OSC members through subcommittees. Motivated by the frustration of lack of direction, goals, and purpose, a group leadership emerged internally from the OSC.

Collaboration, Coordination, and Cooperation

Hord (1986) indicated that collaboration, coordination, and cooperation are used interchangeably in the literature because of confusing and similar definitions. Boyd, Duning, Gomez, Hetzel, King, Patrick, & Whitaker (1992) suggested that distinctions among terminology are important because of the influence of interorganizational relationships on participating agencies. It is appropriate to accurately define interorganizational relationships and put efforts into perspective so that specific

OSC tasks can be generated. State and local agencies have promoted Full Service Schools as an interagency collaborative initiative. Participants interviewed in all three samples referred to the respective sites and OSC as interorganizational collaborative efforts. A review of the data collected concluded that of the three counties examined, only County A demonstrated an authentic interorganizational collaborative effort. At the service level, County A's OSC agreed to pool resources, jointly plan, implement, and evaluate new services and procedures, and delegate individual responsibility for the outcomes of the joint efforts. Additionally, the OSC, through binding interagency agreements, is empowered to negotiate, as well as advocate for, programs and polices leading to more comprehensive service delivery on the systems level. County B's efforts displayed enhanced service coordination for families. County C demonstrated interagency cooperation with sporadic episodes of coordination.

Discussion and Recommendations

Recommendations for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to examine the historical and structural domains of three interorganizational governance bodies responsible for the task of developing and implementing the Full Service Schools initiative in three school districts in Florida. Further research is needed in the several related areas.

One area is assessing the effectiveness of these interorganizational governance structures, which was beyond the

realm of this descriptive study. A second area is determining the state's role in implementing systems-oriented change involving interorganizational collaboration. The perspectives and concerns of local and state agencies and schools may vary greatly. A third area of needed investigation is the changing role of the principal involved in Full Service Schools. The interactions between the site coordinator and the adjoining school principal observed in County A indicated that much work was ahead of the participants in redefining roles and responsibilities brought about by the collaborative nature of the relationships. Furthermore, yet to be explored are the implications of shared decision-making between the site coordinator and the principal. A final area worthy of study might be the development of the internal governance structure of the Planning Council of County B's Full Service School site.

Recommendations for Policy-Makers and Practitioners

The needs of today's students are unique and cannot be met by individual agencies or programs acting independently. Policy-makers are more frequently mandating federal, state, and local governments and agencies to actively participate in systems-oriented change through interorganizational collaboration. Florida's Full Service Schools Act (1990) offers an opportunity for counties, school districts, health and human service delivery areas, and communities to develop strategies to develop interorganizational governing bodies ordered with implementing integrated services. Guidelines and technical assistance on how

to develop strong interorganizational governance structures should be provided for local participants.

Governance of Full Service Schools by either the school or another agency may restrict the effectiveness, efficiency, and level of collaboration. A governance structure dominated by one agency may be viewed by the other participating agencies as just another project. Instead of one agency's domination, perhaps a mutually agreed-upon third party coordinator may provide the coordination of tasks and objectives. Additionally, larger counties may consider smaller, site-based OSC similar to the Planning Council of County B or regional OSC representing specific communities within a district or service delivery area.

In this study several facilitative factors were identified and supported by the literature that should be incorporated in the development of these multi-agency governance structures. These factors included frequent informal and formal interaction among participants, broad community and agency representation among membership, clearly written interagency agreements, shared decision-making and leadership, and task-oriented interagency work groups. Collectively these factors strengthen the interorganizational relationships of the individual OSC responsible for the development and implementation of Florida's Full Service Schools.

REFERENCES

Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1978). Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structures. In W. M. Evan (Ed.), Interorganizational relations (pp. 161-184). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.

Aldrich, H. E. (1976). Resource dependence and interorganizational relations: Local employment service offices and social service sector organizations. Administrative Relations, 7(3), 419-454.

Agranoff, R. (1991). Human services integration: Past and present challenges in public administration. Public Administration Review, 51(6), 533-542.

Bayer, D. L. (1985). Variables in effective interagency relationships. Harlan, KY: Cumberland River Comprehensive Care Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 267 339)

Behrman, R. E. (Ed.). (1991). School-linked services. The Future of Children, 2(1).

Blank, M., & Lombardi, J. (1992). Toward improved services for children and families: Forging new relationships through collaboration (Policy Brief based on the Eighth Annual Symposium of the A.L. Mailman Family Foundation). Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Boyd, B., Duning, B., Gomez, R., Hetzel, R., King, R., Patrick, & Whitaker, K. (1992). Impacts of interagency collaboration on participating organizations. Greeley, CO: University of Northern Colorado. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 346 566)

Bruner, C. (1991). Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions an answers to help policy makers improve children's services. (Available from the Education and Human Services Consortium, c/o IEL, 1001 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 301, Washington, DC 20036-5541)

Bryman, A. (1989). Research methods and organization studies. London: Unwin Hyman.

Center for the Study of Social Policy. (1991). Building an community agenda: Developing local governing entities. Washington, DC: Author.

Chira, S. (1991, May 15). A new role for schools: Directing people to the social services they need. The New York Times Education, pp. 1-2, 4.

Cohen, D. L. (1989, February 1). "We became the hopes and dreams" of all. Education Week, pp. 1, 6-7.

Cunningham, L. L. (1989). Reconstructing local government for well-being and education. Orlando, FL: Paul B. Solomon Memorial Lecture. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 555)

Cunningham, L. L. (1993). Putting the pieces together: Toward a comprehensive program of social reform. Planning and Changing, 27(3), 240-247.

DeStefano, L., & Snauwert, D. (1989). A value-critical approach to transition policy analysis. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Secondary Transition Intervention Effectiveness Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 310 610)

Doty, P. (1982). The role of the evaluation research broker. In L. Saxe & D. Kroetz (Eds.), New directions for program evaluation (No. 14). San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Evan, W. M. (Ed.). (1978). Interorganizational Relations. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Full Service Schools Act of 1990, Florida Statute Code § 402.3026 (1991).

Gardner, S. L. (1991). Failure by fragmentation. Equity and Choice, 6(2), 4-12.

Glass, R. S. (1992). The full-service school. American Teacher, 76(3), 8-9.

Goldman, H., & Intriligator, B. A. (1990). Factors that enhance collaboration among education, health and social service agencies. Arlington, VA: Georgetown University Child Development Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 109)

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. Human Relations, 38(10), 911-936.

Groves, L. (1991, July). Full Service Schools: A strategy for school improvement. (Available from L. Groves, Office of Interagency Affairs, Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL 32399)

Groves, L. (1992a, July). Full Service Schools Update. (Available from L. Groves, Office of Interagency Affairs, Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL 32399)

Groves, L. (1992b, August). Full Service Schools Development. (Available from L. Groves, Office of Interagency Affairs, Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL 32399)

Groves, L. (1993, May). Full Service Schools Update. (Available from L. Groves, Office of Interagency Affairs, Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL 32399)

Groves, L. (1994, April). Full Service Schools Update. (Available from L. Groves, Office of Interagency Affairs, Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL 32399)

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hall, R. H., Clark, J. P., Giordano, P. C., Johnson, P. V., & Van Roekel, M. (1977). Patterns of interorganizational relationships. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 457-471.

Hord, S. M. (1980). Distinguishing between cooperation and collaboration: A case study approach to understanding their relative requirements and outcomes. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 470)

Hord, S. M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 22-26.

Jehl, J., & Kirst, M. (1992, September). Spinning a family support web among agencies, schools. The School Administrator, pp. 8-15.

Kadel, S. (1992). Interagency collaboration: Improving the delivery of services to children and families (Contract No. 91002010). Tallahassee, FL: SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE).

Kagen, S. L., Rivera, A. M., & Parker, F. L. (1990). Collaborations in action: Reshaping services for young children and their families. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Bush Center for Child Development and Social policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 328 363)

Kirst, M. W. (1991). Integrating children's services. Menlo Park, CA: EdSource.

Kirst, M. W. (1992). Financing school-linked services. Policy Brief (7), 1-7. (Available from the University of Southern California Center for Research in Education Finance, Los Angeles)

Louis, K. S., & Rosenblum, S. (1981). Designing and managing inter-organizational networks: Linking R & D with schools. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 207 260)

Melaville, A. I., & Blank, M. J. (1991). What it takes: Structuring interagency partnerships to connect children and families with comprehensive services. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education: A qualitative approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morrill, W. A. (1993, Spring). Seeking better outcomes for children and families. NCSI News, pp. 1-2.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). Proposed national consortium on collaborative services. Alexandria, VA: Author.

New Beginnings. (1990). A feasibility study of integrated services for children and families. (Available from the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, San Diego City Schools, Education Center, Room 2248, 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-2682)

Palaich, R. M., Whitney, T. N., & Paolino, A. R. (1991). Changing delivery systems: Addressing the fragmentation in children and youth services. Columbia: South Carolina ETV. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 769)

Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Payzant, T. W. (1992). New beginnings in San Diego: Developing a strategy for interagency collaboration. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(2), 139-146.

Redburn, F. S. (1977). On human services integration. Public Administration Review, 37, 264-269.

Rist, M. C. (1990). Making schools the hub of services. The American School Board Journal, 177(8), 14.

Roberts-DeGennaro, M. (1988). A study of youth services networks from a political-economy perspective. Journal of Social Service Research, 11(4), 61-73.

Rogers, D. L., & Whetten, D. A. (1982). Interorganizational coordination: Theory, research, and implementation. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Seppanen, P. S. (1990). Promoting voluntary interorganizational arrangements: An analysis of three school-college collaborative projects in Massachusetts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 318 384)

Soler, M. I., Shotten, A. C., & Bell, J.R. (1993). Glass walls: Confidentiality provisions and interagency collaborations. San Francisco, CA: Youth Law Center.

Stephens, E. R. (1988). Promoting interdistrict relations: The preferred policy option for improving education in rural small school districts. Educational Planning, 7(2), 6-17.

Taylor, P. (1991, May 2). Bringing social services into schools: Holistic approach offers health and child care, family counseling. Washington Post, p. A1.

Tyack, D. (1992). Health and social services in public schools: Historical perspectives. The Future of Children, 2(1), 19-31.

Useem, E. L. (1991). What a difference a recession makes: The rise and fall of integrated services for at-risk youth in Massachusetts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 333 093)

Van de Ven, A. H. (1976). On the nature, formation and maintenance of relations among organizations. Academy of Management Review, 1, 24-36.

Van de Ven, A. H., & Ferry, D.L. (1980). Measuring and assessing organizations. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Warren, R. D. (1974). Interorganizational measurement difference between types of organizations. Washington, DC: Public Health Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 099 992)

Yin, R. K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods (rev. ed.). Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. K., & Gwaltney, M. K. (1981). Organizations collaborating to improve educational practice. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.